

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/565,435	01/20/2006	Tetsuya Hayashi	529.45793X00	2189		
26457 7590 07/21/2010 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			EXAM	EXAMINER		
			BOR, HELEN	BOR, HELENE CATHERINE		
SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON	. VA 22209-3873	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	,	3768				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			07/21/2010	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/565,435	HAYASHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
HELENE BOR	3768	

	HELENE BOR	3768					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. Si The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection whi	ahouario lator In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extensions fee under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</li> </ol>							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filling a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):     Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendme							
non-allowable claim(s).  N. I for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.5-9 and 11-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Eric F Winakur/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3768					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's amendments raised issues regarding the relationship of the transparency control means and the image processing means. Questions arise as to whether or not the functions of image processing means and the functions of the transparency control means are being claimed to perform functions not disclosed as performing within the Specification. Further another issue was raised with regard to transparency color bar or bars as both a bar and bars are being claimed within the claims. Currently the Specification is understood to only disclosed rensparency color bar.

In a telephone conversation with the Applicant on 07/14/2010 an additional concern regarding the "means for" and "step for" language was discussed. The Applicant intends to address these concerns in the next response.